



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/648,507

08/25/2003

Vijay Mital

MSFT-1948/301410.01

4233

41505

7590

10/06/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,507

Applicant(s)

MITAL ET AL.

Examiner

Mark A. X Radtke

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 6 July 2006, claim(s) 1, 8 and 16 is/are amended per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-24 are presently pending in the application, of which, claims 1, 8 and 16 are presented in independent form.
2. In light of Applicant's arguments, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 101 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bata (U.S. Patent 6,799,182) in view of Boyd et al. (U.S. Patent 6,901,403 – the patent is referred to as Boyd et al. to avoid confusion with the primary reference).

As to claim 1, Bata teaches a method for associating an application entity managed by an application with a plurality of related service entities managed by a

plurality of application services, the application maintaining application metadata corresponding to the application entity, the application services maintaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities (see Abstract), the method comprising:

matching the related service entities based on the service metadata (see column 5, lines 12-24 and figure 2, content recognizers 160);

combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities (see column 7, lines 35-41);

combining service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata (see column 7, lines 38-44 and column 7, lines 48-60); and

matching the application entity to the context entity based on the application metadata and the context metadata (see column 7, lines 45-47).

Bata does not explicitly teach determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities; and generating a display of the available dynamic actions.

Boyd et al. teaches determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities (see column 8, lines 7-11, "dynamic or live link"); and

generating a display of the available dynamic actions (see figure 8 and see columns 26-27, spanning paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bata by the teaching of Boyd et al. because Bata teaches that "custom applications" can be used by end-users (see Bata, column 4, lines 9-10).

As to claims 2 and 18, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein matching the related service entities comprises matching the related service entities based on attributes of the related service entities (see column 7, Diagram A).

As to claims 3 and 9, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein matching the application entity to the context entity comprises matching the application entity to the context entity based on attributes of the application entity and attributes of the context entity (see column 7, lines 5-20).

As to claims 4 and 11, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising obtaining service metadata corresponding to the related service entities (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claims 5 and 12, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein obtaining the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises:

determining at a context service static actions available on the related service entities (see column 5, lines 55-61); and

querying an action service to determine dynamic actions available on the related service entities (see column 6, line 67 – column 7, line 3).

As to claim 6, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claims 7 and 13, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein providing the service metadata corresponding to the related service entities to the application comprises providing static and dynamic actions available on the related service entities to the application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 8, Bata teaches a method for managing at an application a first service entity at a first application service (see Abstract), the method comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim, Applicant is directed to Examiner's comments regarding claim 1.

As to claim 10, Bata, as modified, teaches comprising identifying that the associated context entity is derived from the first service entity and a second service entity at a second application service, the first service entity being related to the second service entity (see column 7, Diagram A).

As to claim 14, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein managing the first service entity at the application using the provided service metadata comprises:

generating at the application a display of the static and dynamic actions available on the first service entity (see column 8, lines 41-42); and

selecting from the display at the application an action to be performed on the first service entity at the first application service (see column 7, lines 9-10).

As to claim 15, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising:

forwarding the selected action to the first application service (see column 8, lines 41-42); and

performing the selected action at the first application service (see figure 8, step 375).

As to claim 16, Bata teaches a system for managing at an application a first service entity at a first application service (see Abstract), the system comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim, Applicant is directed to Examiner's comments regarding claim 1.

As to claim 17, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising a second application service, said second application service maintaining second service metadata corresponding to a second service entity (see figure 2, element 145B) and providing said second service metadata to said context service, the second service entity being related to the first service entity (see figure 2, element 150B).

As to claim 19, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein the context entity is derived from the first service entity and the second service entity (see column 5, lines 13-24).

As to claim 20, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein said context service provides the first service metadata and the second service metadata to said application, the first service metadata enabling the first service entity to be managed at said application, the second service metadata enabling the second service entity to be managed at said application (see column 5, lines 12-24).

As to claim 21, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising an action service for determining dynamic actions available on the first service entity at said first application service (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 22, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein said context service queries said action service to determine the dynamic actions available on the first service entity and provides the dynamic actions available on the first service entity to said application (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 23, Bata, as modified, teaches further comprising an execution service for providing the application metadata to said context service (see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 5).

As to claim 24, Bata, as modified, teaches wherein said execution service generates a display of the first service metadata (see column 8, lines 41-42).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 6 July 2006 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2165

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1 October 2006